

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/772,756 01/30/2001		01/30/2001	Mohammed Nafie	Tl-31308	9448	
23494	7590	02/14/2006 EXAMINER				
TEXAS IN	ISTRUM	ENTS INCORPOR	DEPPE, BE	DEPPE, BETSY LEE		
P O BOX 65 DALLAS, 7	•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
51122110,				2637		
				DATE MAILED: 02/14/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			tion No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)				
			756	NAFIE ET AL.	NAFIE ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examin	ər	Art Unit					
		Betsy L.	• •	2637					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	on appears on ti	ne cover sheet with t	he correspondence a	ddress				
WHI(- Exte after - If NO - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR FOR THE VER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IN THE MAY BE AVAILABLE OF THE MAILING IN THE MAY BE AVAILABLE OF THE MAY BE AVAI	NG DATE OF T CFR 1.136(a). In no e tion. period will apply and y statute, cause the ap	THIS COMMUNICAT event, however, may a reply to will expire SIX (6) MONTHS epilication to become ABAND	TION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	06 December	2005.						
′=	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.								
3)□	·								
,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposit	ion of Claims	·							
4)⊠	Claim(s) 24-27 is/are pending in the appl	ication.							
,—	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
· —	Claim(s) <u>24-27</u> is/are rejected.								
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election	requirement.						
	ion Papers		·						
_	The specification is objected to by the Exa	aminor							
-	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		ND objected to by the	ho Evaminor					
ات(۱۰									
	Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co		=	• •	SED 4 404(d)				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by t				• •				
	under 35 U.S.C. § 119	He Examiner. IV	ote the attached On	ice Action of form P	10-152.				
	•								
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo	reign priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119	9(a)-(d) or (f).					
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:								
	1. Certified copies of the priority docu								
	2. Certified copies of the priority docu								
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the			eived in this National	l Stage				
	application from the International B	•							
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for	a list of the cen	ified copies not rece	eived.					
Attachmen	t(s)								
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summ						
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94		Paper No(s)/Ma	il Date	0.450)				
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S r No(s)/Mail Date	SB/08)	5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:	al Patent Application (PT	U-152)				
			,						

Application/Control Number: 09/772,756 Page 2

Art Unit: 2637

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed December 6, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- 2. In response to applicant's argument on page 5 that Roberts does not even receive the narrow band packets due to the adaptive notch filter 14, it is implicit/inherent that the DSSS station 10 in Figure 1 receives a signal that includes both wideband and narrow band packets via the antenna. If there weren't any narrow band packets being received by DSSS station 10, then the adaptive notch filter 14 would not be necessary.
- 3. In response to applicant's argument on page 5 that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Application/Control Number: 09/772,756 Page 3

Art Unit: 2637

Claim Objections

4. Claims 24 and 26 are objected to because of the following informalities: in line 10 and 2 of the respective claims, "storing data packet(s)" should be "storing <u>said</u> data packet(s)". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 6. Claims 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts (US Patent No. 6,577,670 B1 cited in the Office Action mailed July 9, 2004) in view of Widdowson (WO 99/38270 cited in the Office Action mailed December 7, 2004) and Tsui et al. (US Patent No. 6,061,393)
- 7. With regard to claims 24, 26 and 27, Figure 1 of Roberts discloses the claimed invention including a wideband radio unit (10) and a narrowband radio unit (20). (See also column 2, line 31 column 3, line 64 and column 4, lines 43-47) It is implicit/inherent that the received signal is decoded after the narrow band signals/packets have been excluded. However, Roberts does not disclose that the narrow band radio section decodes the one or more narrowband signals/packets and the wideband radio section subtracts the decoded narrowband signals/packets from the received data packet before decoding the received data packet. Furthermore, Roberts does not storing the data packets.

Art Unit: 2637

Figures 10 and 11 of Widdowson teaches decoding the narrow band packets and subtracting the decoded Bluetooth packets from the received data packet (40) before decoding the received data packet (21, 18, 19). Since Roberts discloses excluding narrowband signals/packets from the wideband signals/packets (see column 1, lines 20-26), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of removing narrowband interference taught by Widdowson with the circuit of Roberts in order to avoid the requirement of filters with very sharp cut-offs to attenuate the narrowband signal. (See Widdowson, page 2, lines 11-14)

Tsui et al. teaches storing data before processing. (See column 6, lines 25-28 and 60-62) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to stored the received data in the device disclosed by Roberts in view of Widdowson in order to ensure that the data is available for subsequent processing. Storing the data also provides greater flexibility in determining when to process the data since the data does not have to be processed in "real-time" (i.e. as it is received).

8. With regard to claim 25, Roberts in view of Widdowson and Tsui et al. disclose the claimed invention including a narrowband unit comprising a Bluetooth system and the one or more narrow band packets comprising Bluetooth packets. (See Roberts, column 1, lines 29-35 and column 2, lines 40-44)

Application/Control Number: 09/772,756 Page 5

Art Unit: 2637

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Betsy L. Deppe whose telephone number is (571) 272-3054. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jay Patel can be reached on (571) 272 - 2988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Application/Control Number: 09/772,756

Art Unit: 2637

Page 6

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Betsy L. Deppe Primary Examiner Art Unit 2637